DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 307 698 EA 021 023

AUTHOR Hamm, Keith E.
TITLE The Evolution of State Legislative Education Committees: Independent Sources of Power or Parts of "Cozy Triangles"?
PUB DATE Mar 89
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, March 27-31, 1989).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Administration; Educational Development; *Educational Legislation; *Educational Planning; *Educational Policy; *Educational Practices; Elementary Secondary Education; *Government School Relationship; Politics of Education

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the extent to which the potential exists for state education committees to become an integral part of the subgovernment process. Four general criteria were evaluated: (1) committee jurisdictional responsibility for education policy; (2) continuity of membership on committees; (3) the extent of representation of those "interested" in education policy on the education committees; and (4) the extent to which those "interested" on the committee and their allies control the setting of the legislative agenda. Evidence does not indicate that the committees are necessarily part of the subgovernment process, at least not when using the most restrictive definition. Appended are 12 tables and 29 references. (SI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED307698

The Evolution of State Legislative Education Committees: Independent Sources of Power or Parts of "Cozy Triangles"?

Keith E. Hamm
Rice University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Keith E. Hamm

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper prepared for the 1989 AERA Annual Meeting, San Francisco, CA.

EA 021 023

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Evolution of State Legislative Education Committees: Independent Sources of Power or Parts of "Cozy Triangles"

INTRODUCTION

State legislative policy making today is more decentralized and democratized than in the past. Iron-handed legislative leaders are being replaced by individuals who grant the rank-and-file legislator greater involvement in the policy process (Wunnicke and Randall, 1986). With responsibility somewhat more dispersed, the committee system has developed into an integral aspect of the decision-making process in a significant number of state legislative chambers(Francis, 1985). One possible consequence of this decentralization is the development and maintenance of "subgovernments".

In the subgovernment model a stable set of participants--including the legislative committee with jurisdiction over a policy area, relevant interest groups and executive agencies--coalesce to control programs. Debate exists in the political science literature over the extent to which this "model" of policymaking is accurate in terms of the breadth, commitment, and success of the participants. Some have described the process as involving a single committee, single interest group and single agency, or an "iron triangle", while others envision expansive "issue networks", in which a large number of participants are involved within a policy area, exhibiting variable degrees of interest or commitment. (e.g., Griffith, 1939; Freeman, 1965; Heclo, 1978). Research at the state legislative level indicates that complex, yet modestly restricted sets of policy relationships exist, with the committees serving as the center of the policy relationships (e.g., see Browne, 1987; Hamm, 1986, 1987).

The limited purpose of this paper is to evaluate the extent to which committees dealing with education policy exhibit characteristics which would make them the linch-pin in subgovernment development. No attempt is made to evaluate all aspects of the subgovernment model as it applies to education policy. Rather, four criteria are analyzed: (1) committee jurisdictional responsibility for education policy; (2) continuity of membership on committees; (3) the extent of representation of those "interested" in education policy on the education committees; and (4) the extent to which interesteds on the committee and their allies control the setting of the legislative agenda.

In order for stable relationships to develop, the committee system must be organized in such a way that only a few committees are involved in the evaluation of education policy, and if possible, that it is their only consideration (Criteria 1). Under such a system, the main interest groups and state agencies concerned with education policy are more likely to develop close working ties with members of the committee than if numerous committees are responsible for evaluating education policy. However, for the subgovernment system to develop, committee members should be considered the specialists in education policy. This would require that they develop a working knowledge of most facets of education policy, a consequence more likely to occur with continuity of membership on the committees (Criteria 2). The third criteria suggests that these should be composed of those most interested in education policy, due to their constituency, occupation, interest group affiliation, or previous government experience. The more these "interesteds" are

"overrepresented" on the education committees, the more likely that subgovernment formation is likely. The last criteria examined in this paper refers to the control of the committee's agenda by the "interested" committee members. In other words, if the bulk of the bills considered by the committees responsible for education policy were introduced by "interesteds" on the committee, perhaps at the suggestion of concerned interest groups or state agency personnel, then there is a higher probability of subgovernment control.

DATA SOURCES

The bulk of the data presented in this paper was collected as part of a larger project studying state legislative organization and policymaking from 1971 through 1986 (see Hedlund and Powers for an elaboration on this point.) In this report, data will be presented from the lower and upper houses of 16 state legislatures-- Arizona, California, Florida, Georgia, Iowa, Nevada, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Washington, West Virginia, and Wisconsin. For these 32 legislative chambers the data files contain a separate record for every member of each committee for each of the legislative sessions examined. Data about the legislator's occupation, length of legislative service, sex, education level, experience on the particular legislative committee, and political party affiliation are included in these records.

FINDINGS

Which Committees Have Responsibility for Education Policy?

The first section of this analysis is devoted to ascertaining which committees have responsibility for substantive (not appropriations) education policy. A simple convention is adopted in making this determination. The title of each legislative committee is taken at face value as indicating its major jurisdiction. While problems exist in determining the exact jurisdiction, this decision rule should provide at least a rough approximation of responsibility. For purposes of this paper the jurisdictional responsibility may be conceived as consisting of a continuum. At one end of this continuum education is not in the title of any committee name, while at the other end education policymaking is so developed that multiple committees exist, each with a unique jurisdiction (e.g., two committees, one for K-12 education and the other for higher education). In other words, this continuum traces the differentiation of education policy responsibility, using formal committee names as the indicator.

The overall distributions of the 99 state legislative chambers for two different legislative sessions are shown in Table 1. An initial observation is that tremendous differences exist among these legislatures as to how education policy is treated. In roughly one in eight legislative chambers during the late 1970s, education was not given its own exclusive niche within the committee system, while in roughly one in five chambers specialization had developed to the point that there were two identifiable, but non-overlapping, education committees. However, more than a simple majority of the state legislatures assign a single committee sole responsibility for education, and only education, policy. Most of these committees are chamber specific, but in three legislatures (or six chambers), a joint committee, composed of members from both the house and senate, performs this task.

What has been the trend over time in terms of committee differentiation? Data from Table 1 indicate, at least in the aggregate, that relative stability prevailed between 1977-78 and 1985-86. A more in-depth session by session analysis from 1971 through 1985 of the 32 legislative chambers in the data set suggests that significant variation exists among the chambers on this point. Here, roughly 62 percent of the chambers evidenced no change in committee jurisdiction over the eight legislative sessions examined (Table not shown). On the other hand, three chambers experienced one realignment of education policy jurisdictions, while six undertook change on two different occasions. Finally, in three chambers (i.e.,North Carolina Senate, Ohio Senate, and Wisconsin Senate), there were at least three significant changes in committee responsibility. The most extreme case is the Wisconsin Senate which changed the jurisdiction for education policy at the beginning of each session.

An issue related to committee jurisdiction involves number of positions allocated to education committees, particularly since the issue of education policy has received such a high profile in state legislatures. Since the publication of A Nation at Risk, and similar types of books, state legislatures have responded with numerous policy initiatives (see E. Hedlund, 1989). An hypothesis is that a greater number of legislators would see service on education committees more desirable in recent years, that a greater percent of them would request assignment to these committees, resulting in an expansion of positions on these committees. The data presented in Table 2, however, do not support this hypothesis. For both chambers, the peak period was in the early 1970s. The reduction between 1971 and 1975 may be due, in part, to the legislative reform movement which called for the consolidation of committees and a subsequent reduction in committee assignments per member. While in the early 1980s there was an increase in total education committee positions relative to 1979 levels in the lower houses, no such spurt occurred in the state senates. If anything, there was an actual reduction of committee positions.

In summary, the analysis so far indicates that: (1) in most state legislatures education policy is assigned to one or two specialized committees; (2) in most legislatures there is continuity in committee jurisdiction from session to session, but in a few chambers changes occur frequently; and (3) while in the state houses there has been an increase in the 1980s in the number of education committee positions, this trend has not appeared in state senates.

Continuity in Education Committee Membership

The establishment of committees with responsibility for education policy is not sufficient to guarantee that that specialization in education matters will develop. In addition, committee members must develop "issue familiarity" and "expertise" in education matters (Hedlund and Powers, 1989). There is no sure way to predict this occurrence. However, a necessary, but not a sufficient, condition is the development of a continuity of committee membership. Members who are reassigned to the education committees, and who, therefore, have been exposed to a wide array of education issues in past sessions, have the potential for becoming education "specialists" within the legislature. On the other hand, if these committee positions rotate at the beginning of each legislative session, and if a number of inexperienced, first-term members are assigned to them, then the development of "expertise" will be significantly less.

In this study three measures tap the continuity of membership concept. The

first measure is simply the percent of committee members who served in the legislature during the last session. This experience measure highlights the extent to which the membership is not composed of first-term members. In addition to meeting the minimal requirement of not having a substantial number of neophytes on the committee, two additional measures focus on continuity. Committee constancy refers to the percent of re-elected members who returned to the same committee to which they were assigned in the previous session. A related measure is termed committee carryover. It focuses on the percent of committee members in session T+1 who had service on the committee in the previous session. An example may help to clarify the meaning of these terms. Assume that committee X had a membership of 10 in session T and 12 in session T+1. Eight of the committee members from session T were re-elected, and four of these were re-appointed to the committee X in session T +1. The remaining 8 members on the committee in time T+1 included 2 first-term legislators. Therefore, the experience factor would be .83 (10/12), the constancy measure would be .50 (4/8), and the carryover measure would be .33 (4/12), (see Hedlund and Powers, 1989).

Each education committee is treated as a separate unit of observation in the following analysis. Therefore, if a chamber has three committees which have education-related jurisdictions, then three values for experience, carryover, and constancy are computed. In addition, these committee values are compared to those for the all committees in each chamber by computing a ratio score.

To what extent have the education committees developed the potential to become "specialized" decision-making units within state legislatures? The data presented in Table 3 indicate an intriguing answer. First, education committees are rarely the dumping grounds for a host of first-term legislators. In fact, the mean committee experience value is .677, and only 15.6 percent of the committees have less than a majority of experienced legislators. At the same time, about 53 percent of the education committees have at least a majority of members who have served on the same committee during the previous session. However, the lack of specialization for the remaining committees was not due entirely to the random reassignment of members. Rather, the mean education committee constancy measure is .680, and only in only 18 percent of the cases are less than a majority of the re-elected members reappointed to the same committee. The lower carryover figures are due to a combination of changes in committee size from one session to the next, and the fact that several members who had served on the education committees did not seek re-election.

How does the level of specialization on the education committees compare with that found on other state legislative committees? If just the overall means are examined in Table 4, then the conclusion is that no substantial differences exist between the values for education committees and those for the chamber's committee system. A more in-depth analysis indicates that in roughly two-thirds of the cases analyzed education committees have a smaller share of experienced (i.e, not first-term) members, that in a majority of the cases the constancy ratio is greater than 1.0, and that for the committee carryover variable about an equal percent of values fall above and below the 1.0 value. In summary, the education committees do not possess significantly greater levels of specialization relative to other committees.

The literature on state level committees offers the possibility that committee specialization has increased during the past 20 years due to increased continuity of membership on the committees. In a recent study of continuity in

committee membership in 18 states, Hedlund and Powers note for the lower houses and senates, respectively, that:

> Higher levels of constancy, carryover, and legislative experience are found for the 1983 period, with lower levels being observed for 1971-1973. These differences appear to reflect the relative turnover rates among members, being lower in recent years and higher in the early 1970s. (1989: 14)

> Again, the 1983-1985 sessions tend to have higher continuity scores while the 1971-1973 and 1981-1983 tend to be lower (1989: 15)

The data in Tables 5 and 6 extend these findings for education committees. For five of the six measures the mean value for the 1971 to 1973 period is less than those for the 1983 to 1985 period. For two measures, committee carryover and committee experience, the F-Ratio for a one-way analysis of variance is statistically significant ($p < .05$). Also, the differences in committee carryover, committee constancy, committee experience, and the ratio measure for committee constancy between 1971-1973 and 1983-1985 sessions are statistically significantly ($p < .05$). In addition, significant contrasts exist for four committee carryover comparisons and for ten committee experience comparisons. In summary, while there is no consistent trend for increases in these measures over time, there are significant differences between the earliest and latest sessions in the study.

A final concern involves the impact of legislative professionalism on committee continuity. The working assumption is that those legislatures which are more professional will experience greater stability in committee membership. While there are several possible indicators for professionalism, in this paper the choice is to rely strictly on salary to distinguish among state legislatures. Recent work has shown this indicator to be extremely useful in terms of differentiating state legislatures (Squire, 1988). A trichotomous variables is created such that base salary in excess of $20,000 is coded as high, one less than $10,000 is coded as low, and the remainder are listed as medium.

The results shown in Table 7 confirm the relationship between professionalism and committee continuity. For each of the six relationships (three variables for two chambers) the mean continuity score is highest for the most professional chambers, followed by the medium, and then the lowest professional legislatures. Examining the mean scores for the ratio measures in Table 8 adds confidence to the initial finding. Here the relationship holds in five of six cases, the lone exception being for the experience ratio measure in the lower chambers. In summary, while the value for a continuity measure (e.g., carryover) for individual chambers among the medium and low professional states may exceed the respective value for a chamber in the highest professional category, the overall trend indicates that the greatest experience, carryover, and constancy in education committee membership are to be found among the most highly professional legislatures.

Occupational Characteristics of Legislators on Education Committees

State legislators have numerous reasons for wanting to be assigned to specific committees. They may be interested because of the nature of their

constituency, because they advocate certain issues dealt with by a specific committee, or because of their past government experience (e.g., requesting service on the local government committee given their background as mayor of a large city). In this paper the emphasis will be on the relationship of occupation to service on the education committees.

Legislators, in their committee assignments, often wish to deal with topics that are related to their professional competence and expertise. Studies of the U.S. Congress indicate that for certain "interest" committees, members' occupational backgrounds are significantly related to committee requests in the House (e.g., Shepsle, 1978) or to the overrepresentation of interested occupations on certain committees in the U.S. Senate even when taking constituency interests into account (Matthews, 1960: 155-156). Recently, Bullock found that 10 percent of written reasons for committee assignment requests in the U.S. Senate stressed occupational experiences, with most of these confined to Finance and Judiciary Committees (1985: 796-797).

At the state level, this gravitation of occupational interests to committees with jurisdiction over relevant bills appears to be widespread. Scholars have long recognized this tendency for certain members to gravitate to particular committees.

> Legislators are frequently assigned to particular committees because of their occupational background. Thus, lawyers are often assigned to criminal procedures or judiciary, school administrators and teachers to education and farmers to agriculture committees. (Price and Bell, 1975: 173).

> A member's background, experience, and competence in a particular area are important criteria...Lawyers seek to be named to judiciary, and have a far better chance of getting appointed than do nonlawyers...Legislators who work or who have worked in the area of education, such as teachers or school board members, frequently find their way onto education committees. Farmers and those with occupational ties to farming choose agriculture committees. Insurance brokers seek out assignments to committees having jurisdiction over insurance and usually obtain them (Rosenthal, 1981: 185)

> It should also be remembered that at the state level, the membership of many committees is heavily weighted with legislators whose occupational interests coincide with the topics handled by the committee (educators, farmers, lawyers, insurance brokers (Jewell and Patterson, 1986: 166).

Comments on the process in additional state legislatures tend to confirm the general thrust of these remarks (e.g., Stanley, 1975 on Alabama; Clark and Lippitt, 1981 on New York) As a result of this assignment process, for some committees, the relevant occupational group has a majority of the committee membership, as in the case of the bankers on the Banking Committee in the Alabama Senate (Stanley, 1971:60).

Two recent studies provide additional confirmation to this contention. In a study of 12 committees in Nebraska, ..."in terms of occupational background, farmers and ranchers form a majority on Agriculture and Environment Committee,

lawyers and those with experience in law enforcement constitute 5 of 8 members on the Judiciary Committee while the Public Health and Welfare Committee has a preponderance of legislators who make their living in health and social welfare occupations" (Hamm, 1987: 17). The basis for "interesteds" to congregate on the Education Committee was related more to campaign support.

> The Education is a good example of a potentially split committee. Of the 8 members, 5, including the lone former teacher on the committee, received major campaign contributions from the Nebraska State Education Association while the 3 remaining members of the committee, all former school board members (including a former school administrator), received no such contributions. The potential impact of these contributions was noted by one proponent of a bill before the Education Committee that would have prohibited school districts from deducting political contributions from employee salaries. One witness noted ...that five of the eight members of this committee have been funded by the NSEA and NSEA funding to these five committee members averages 18 percent, with a high of 25.80 percent and a low of 11.46 percent. In this committee alone, the NSEA has $18,355 invested (Hamm, 1987: 17).

Another recent study of committee composition in Colorado suggests the complexity of education membership characteristics.

> Membership on the House and Senate Education Committee indicates the variety of interests which may be presented. Among the "interesteds" in the lower chamber committee, the chair of the Committee is a former school board president, three legislators are current or former K-12 teachers, with one of these a past president of the Colorado Federation of Teachers, two members are faculty members at Colorado universities with one of these individuals also on a local school district accountability commission. In addition, two of the remaining five members of the 1985 Education Committee had previous Committee experience, one as chair in 1983-1984. On the nine-person Senate Committee, the chair of the Committee is a former school board president. In terms of actual teaching experience, one member is a college professor, one teaches economics part-time at a junior college, while two other members are secondary education teachers (one of these is also an administrator). Two additional members have training as educators, with one doing graduate work in education and the other having an undergraduate minor in education, though it is unclear as to whether they actually taught. One of the three remaining committee members represents a district containing a major institution of higher education (Hamm, 1986: 334-335).

In the present paper the emphasis will be simply on the representation of those who have education-related occupations on the education committees. The occupations, up to a maximum of three, of each legislator were coded. An individual was counted as having an educationally-related occupation if he/she listed the following: college or university teacher, K-12 (secondary or elementary) education teacher, school administrator (college and K-12 levels), or educational consultant.[1] Then, the percent of "educators" was determined for each committee.

At the outset, the initial research questions relate to the extent to which educators dominate the education committee, and whether they do so more than

other key occupational groups dominate their relevant committees. The data provided in Table 10 provide insight into both issues. First, "educators" ,as defined in this paper, constitute an average of 23 percent of the committee membership while, in comparison, the mean percentage value is 56 percent for businesspersons on business committees, 54 percent for lawyers on judiciary and criminal matter committees, and 39 percent for agricultural-related occupations on agriculture committees. While these latter three groups comprise a majority of the membership in at least 40 percent of the relevant committees, educators are a majority in only 5.6 percent of the 252 committees studied. While educators may be placed on education committees, they do not dominate as is the case with other occupational groups.

Are educators overrepresented on education committees relative to their strength in the legislative chamber, and how does this level of over-representation compare with that for lawyers, farmers, and businesspersons? As shown in Table 11, in nine out of every ten education committees the representation ratio for educators exceeds 1.0, with an overall mean slightly in excess of 2.0. In a comparative sense, the mean ratio is higher for educators than for businesspersons, but somewhat lower than for lawyers and farmers. In fact, while in about 26 percent of the education committees studied the ratio figure exceeded 2.5, comparable figures for lawyers on judiciary and farmers on agriculture were 48 and 60 percent, respectively.

The next question is whether the trend is for educators to increase their representation on education committees during the 1971-1985 period? The findings are somewhat mixed. (See Table 11.) For the absolute percentage variable, the values for 1971 are significantly lower than those found in latter years of 1975, 1979, 1981, and 1985. However, after the 1975 level was established, no further significant increases are noted. Using the ratio measure, we note that the peak was reached in 1977, and then dipped with the figure for 1981 being less than that found at the start of the time period. In summary, there does not appear to be any inexorable movement toward the greater domination of education committees by those with an education-related occupation. Of course, if information were available on past occupations of legislators and experience as school board members, the conclusion may be different.

The final issue centers on the extent to which the representation of educators on the education committee varies as a function of the degree of professionalism of the state legislatures. The working assumption is that the higher the level of professionalism, the greater the degree of representation, both in absolute and ratio terms. The results shown in Table 12 confirm this relationship in only one of four comparisons. An unusual curvilinear relationship emerges for the other three. Therefore, while professionalism appears to affect continuity of education committee membership, the impact on the representation of particular occupational groups is not as discernible.

Who Controls the Committee Agenda?

A key issue in the debate over subgovernments is who is able to set the committee's agenda. The more "interested" members on the committee introduce legislation which monopolizes the committee's time, the greater potential there is for subgovernment dominance. Of course, the alliance patterns undertaken by these participants must be analyzed, but the greater potential for control would seem to exist as the agenda is more controlled by the "interesteds". No

extensive cross-state comparisons can be presented at this time. Instead, it is possible to summarize the findings from previous studies of education committees in Colorado and Nebraska.

A basic finding is that while members of the education committees in these two states tend to introduce a fair share of the eventual legislation that is considered, they do not have as significant a control as do members of other committees (e.g., the Colorado Senate and House Agriculture Committees or the Nebraska Business and Labor Committee). In Colorado, the extent to which committee members control the agenda of the education committees varies among the four committees (two in each chamber) which are responsible for substantive education policy. The figures are significantly higher (73 and 72 percent) for the committees dealing with K-12 education than for those (29 and 52 percent) dealing with higher education policy (Hamm, 1986). The results for Nebraska suggest that there the members of the Education Committee were responsible, both individually and collectively in terms of committee bills, for 40 percent of the bills to come before that committee. This figure is about two-and-one-half times the value that would obtain just on the basis of random chance (Hamm, 1987).

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this short report has been to examine the extent to which the potential exists for state education committees to become an integral part of the subgovernment process. Four general criteria were evaluated. Indications are that most education policy is the responsibility of specialized committees within the state legislatures, and that a fair degree of continuity of membership exists, particularly among the most professional legislatures. However, "educators" do not tend to dominate these committees to the extent that other occupational groups are overrepresented on their respective committees. The agenda is not as controlled by the education committee members as it is for other committees.

In conclusion, the evidence does not indicate that the committees are necessarily part of the subgovernment process, as least not when using the the most restrictive definition. However, greater study must proceed on the issue of interest group and agency involvement, committee decision making, and the ratification by the entire chamber of education committee decisions before any summary evaluation may be presented.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I wish to thank Ronald Hedlund for his permission to use the committee continuity and committee occupation data presented in this study. Any interpretation or evaluation is, of course, my responsibility. In addition, I wish to thank Woody Latham for his assistance in coding and keypunching of additional data.

ENDNOTES

1. In a few cases, legislators listed one of their occupations as student. However, while these were coded with the educators, they constitute such a small percentage of educators that they do not alter the results.

Table 1

Committees Dealing with Education Policy
in State Legislative Chambers
(1977-1978 and 1985-1986)*

Type of Committee(s) Dealing with Education Policy		Years 1977-1978**	1985-1986***
I.	No Education-Related Committee Listed	2.0%	3.0%
II.	Single Committee with Shared Policy Jurisdiction(e.g., Health, Education, and Welfare)	10.1%	11.1%
III.	Single Education Committee	61.6%	58.6%
IV.	Single Joint Education Committee for House and Senate Chambers****	6.1%	6.1%
V.	Two Education Committees-- "Education" Committee and Second Education-Related Committee	0.0%	1.0%
VI.	Two Committees- Education Committee and Shared Jurisdiction Committee (e.g., Higher Education and Regulated Professions)	0.0%	2.0%
VII.	Two Education Committees--K-12 Committee and Higher Education Committee	20.2%	17.1%
VIII.	Three Education Committees- K-12 Committee, Higher Education Committee,and "Other" Education Committee (i.e., Select School Reorganization Committee)	0.0%	1.0%
		100.0 (N=99)	100.0 (N=99)

* Appropriations Committees are excluded.

** Information on committees in 1977-78 is taken from the National Conference of State Legislatures' Directory of State Legislative Leaders and Committee Assignments.

*** Information for 1985-86 is taken from Council of State Governments' State Legislative Leadership, Committees and Staff 1985-1986.

**** In Connecticut, Maine, and Massachusetts there is a single joint education committee. I have counted these committees twice, once for each chamber.

Table 2a

Total Number of Positions on Education Committees in
32 State Legislative Chambers
(1971- 1985)

	Year							
Chamber	1971	1973	1975	1977	1979	1981	1983	1985
Senate	257	216	180	194	194	181	177	183
House	455	442	390	404	391	405	432	427

Table 2b

Extent of Change in Number of Education Committee Positions
Between 1971 Session and 1985 Session in 32 State Legislative Chambers

Extent of Change					
Minor Change (< 3 seats)		Moderate Change (3 to 9 seats)		Major Change (> 9 seats)	
Senate	House	Senate	House	Senate	House
AZ	ND	FL	AZ	IA (-11)	GA (-26)
CA	NV	GA	CA	NC (-19)	NC (+13)
ND	PA	NV	FL	PA (-12)	TX (-24)
OH	SD	TX	IA	WA (-10)	
SD	TN		OH		
WV	WV		WI		
WI					
46.9%		31.3%		21.9%	

Table 3

Experience, Carryover, and Constancy on Education Committees
in 32 State Legislative Chambers
(1971-1985)

Percent	Committee Experience**	Committee Carryover	Committee Constancy
0.0- 24.9	.7*	10.6	2.6
25.0- 49.9	14.7	34.1	15.7
50.0- 74.9	44.7	41.4	37.0
75.0- 99.9	37.0	13.2	37.0
100	2.9	.7	7.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Mean	67.73	51.50	68.00
S. D.	16.89	20.06	20.68
N	273	273	273

* Percent of education committees with this level of experience, carryover or constancy.
** Please see text for definition of these terms.

Table 4

Relative Levels of Experience, Carryover, and Constancy
for Education Committees in 32 State Legislative Chambers
(1971-1985)

Ratio	Committee Experience**	Committee Carryover***	Committee Constancy****
.01 - .50	2.9%*	5.5%	4.8%
.51 - .99	60.8%	43.2%	33.7%
1.00	1.8%	1.8%	3.7%
1.01 - 1.50	34.4%	43.6%	53.5%
1.51 - 2.00	0.0%	5.5%	4.4%
2.01+	0.0%	.4%	.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	.92	1.01	.92
S.D.	.18	.32	.18
N	273	273	273

* Entries are the percent of committees studied which had the ratio measure listed in the left column.

** Proportion of education committee members with experience divided by mean experience level for all committees in that chamber.

*** Carryover proportion for the education committee divided by mean carryover level for all committees in that chamber.

**** Constancy proportion for the education committee divided by mean constancy level for all committees in that chamber.

Table 5a

Experience, Carryover and Constancy
on Education Committees by Year
(1971-1985)

	Years						
	1971 to 1973	1973 to 1975	1975 to 1977	1977 to 1979	1979 to 1981	1981 to 1983	1983 to 1985
Experience							
Mean	58.46	64.61	71.55	71.27	72.30	61.14	73.98
S.D.	20.96	16.02	17.70	12.62	14.79	13.36	15.78
Carryover							
Mean	43.59	49.42	54.00	51.63	54.53	47.62	59.25
S.D.	23.41	15.01	22.65	19.43	17.11	19.21	19.88
Constancy							
Mean	62.71	64.37	67.97	66.56	69.48	69.38	75.28
S.D.	21.77	21.52	21.62	21.37	19.10	20.81	17.44
Experience Ratio							
Mean	1.21	.91	.94	.94	.94	.90	.92
S.D.	.88	.19	.21	.16	.17	.17	.15
Carryover Ratio							
Mean	.94	1.02	1.03	.93	1.04	1.06	1.03
S.D.	.36	.31	.37	.27	.30	.40	.25
Constancy Ratio							
Mean	.98	1.01	1.06	.98	1.06	1.07	1.10
S.D.	.09	.30	.34	.26	.27	.30	.20

Table 6

One-Way Analysis of Variance
(By Year)

Variable	F-Ratio	Significance Level	Significant Contrasts
Experience	5.45	.000	71 to 73/83 to 85; 73 to 75/83 to 85; 81 to 83/83 to 85
Carryover	2.65	.016	71 to 73/83 to 85; 73 to 75/83 to 85; 77 to 79/83 to 85; 81 to 83/83 to 85; 79 to 81/81 to 83
Constancy	1.56	.160	71 to 73/83 to 85; 73 to 75/83 to 85
Experience Ratio	.62	.714	
Carryover Ratio	.96	.452	
Constancy Ratio	1.20	.304	71 to 73/83 to 85; 77 to 79/83 to 85

Table 7
Experience, Carryover, and Constancy on Education Committees in Degree of Professionalism in State Legislatures

Chamber	Experience Mean	Experience 1971 to 1973	Experience 1983 to 1985	Carryover Mean	Carryover 1971 to 1973	Carryover 1983 to 1985	Constancy Mean	Constancy 1971 to 1973	Constancy 1983 to 1985
Senate									
High*									
CA	82	100	82	71	91	82	89	91	90
OH	74	78	67	52	56	56	80	100	83
PA	81	75	80	70	69	70	74	69	58
WI	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Medium*									
AZ	67	56	100	59	44	89	83	67	89
FL	66	45	82	39	18	36	58	50	67
GA	77	80	90	65	63	86	75	77	93
IA	55	26	70	44	11	70	69	33	88
TN	84	91	89	70	73	89	77	73	100
WA	78	86	76	60	78	76	71	53	93
Low*									
NV	62	57	NA	43	43	NA	68	60	NA
NC	58	49	49	41	32	38	66	75	73
ND	66	38	71	64	50	57	78	80	80
SD	59	57	86	45	29	57	70	40	100
TX	72	33	64	61	33	55	51	33	67
WV	70	60	75	63	53	58	89	80	100
House									
High									
CA	70	76	100	60	76	85	72	76	79
OH	67	NA	83	52	NA	67	67	NA	75
PA	85	95	96	66	75	92	77	88	92
WI	71	85	47	58	62	21	75	89	67
Medium									
AZ	79	67	87	64	58	80	86	88	92
FL	62	44	75	32	22	44	41	43	42
GA	77	68	89	71	61	87	89	88	95
IA	67	21	80	51	08	68	71	43	85
TN	72	48	76	59	43	48	75	77	77
WA	62	50	71	39	37	47	57	64	59
Low									
NV	53	43	67	28	14	44	53	50	57
NC	63	56	55	35	22	39	54	35	65
ND	63	50	61	56	44	50	85	70	75
SD	47	31	46	40	31	46	64	57	67
TX	74	43	89	46	17	56	52	36	56
WV	45	48	56	38	40	44	56	53	69

* Refers to high, medium or low levels of professionalism.

Table 8

Ratio of Experience, Carryover, and Constancy on Education Committees to Mean Chamber Values in "More Professional" and "Less Professional" State Legislatures

Chamber	Experience Mean	Experience 1971 to 1973	Experience 1983 to 1985	Ratio Carryover Mean	Ratio Carryover 1971 to 1973	Ratio Carryover 1983 to 1985	Constancy Mean	Constancy 1971 to 1973	Constancy 1983 to 1985
Senate									
High*									
CA	1.02	1.12	.86	1.08	1.14	1.00	1.20	1.05	1.08
OH	.99	1.16	.93	.91	1.30	.84	1.17	1.41	1.24
PA	.98	.95	.91	1.03	.79	.95	1.07	1.44	.81
WI	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Medium*									
AZ	.89	.86	1.04	1.01	.80	1.11	1.17	.94	1.02
FL	.94	.82	.88	.80	.55	.62	1.12	.88	1.29
GA	.94	.93	1.02	.95	.94	1.12	.98	1.10	1.08
IA	.75	.64	.81	.84	.33	1.01	1.10	.68	1.17
TN	.97	1.01	1.07	1.03	1.01	1.07	1.01	.89	1.10
WA	1.02	1.08	.97	.96	.96	1.19	1.03	.91	1.15
Low*									
NV	.85	.75	NA	.71	.71	NA	.91	1.03	NA
NC	.90	1.23	.76	.83	1.10	.72	1.00	1.09	1.16
ND	.95	.77	1.35	1.29	1.07	.88	1.30	1.06	1.31
SD	.89	.91	1.10	.87	.64	.84	.92	.57	1.14
TX	.93	.65	.70	.92	.85	.76	.63	.36	.88
WV	.94	.97	1.01	.91	.96	.82	1.17	1.00	1.10
House									
High									
CA	.93	1.01	1.05	1.46	1.58	1.51	1.31	1.25	1.41
OH	.83	NA	.94	.94	NA	1.08	.97	NA	1.01
PA	1.07	1.20	.99	1.27	1.50	1.31	1.15	1.35	1.17
WI	.96	1.16	.65	1.29	1.59	.54	1.22	1.53	1.22
Medium									
AZ	1.04	.96	1.01	1.29	1.32	1.27	1.27	1.36	1.23
FL	.83	.75	.90	.82	.65	.90	.81	.73	.86
GA	1.01	.88	1.00	1.08	1.43	1.01	1.05	1.17	1.02
IA	.94	.58	.91	1.14	.40	1.06	1.11	.62	1.13
TN	.92	.76	.96	.96	.92	.77	.98	1.13	.99
WA	.92	.76	1.00	.94	1.01	1.01	.96	1.05	1.00
Low									
NV	.86	.84	.97	.82	.54	1.19	.94	.93	1.31
NC	.95	.86	.90	.98	1.10	.85	.97	.71	.96
ND	.95	.77	1.35	1.29	1.07	.88	1.30	1.06	1.31
SD	.64	.43	.60	.81	.78	.82	.88	.86	.88
TX	1.03	.96	1.14	1.36	1.00	1.46	1.18	1.06	1.27
WV	.49	.53	.66	.77	1.14	1.00	.82	.62	1.30

* Refers to high, medium or low levels of professionalism.

Table 9

Occupational Interests on Education, Judiciary, and Agriculture Committees in 36 State Legislative Chambers (1971-1986)*

Percent of Committee Members Who Have Occupationally-Related Interests	Education Committees	Judiciary Committees	Agriculture Committees	Business Committees
0%	7.5%**	2.4%	7.2%	0.0%
.1- 16.6%	28.2%	7.0%	16.5%	1.2%
16.7- 33.3%	42.9%	11.0%	28.8%	6.6%
33.4- 49.9%	15.8%	23.9%	14.4%	23.6%
50.0- 66.6%	4.4%	24.7%	11.5%	39.6%
66.7- 83.3%	1.2%	17.3%	25.5%	23.3%
83.4- 99.9%	0.0%	7.4%	4.1%	6.8%
100.0%	0.0%	6.3%	.6%	.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	23.3	54.3	39.0	56.6
S. D.	14.9	25.1	26.6	16.4
N	252	255	236	245

* Entries are the percent of legislative sessions from 1971 to 1986 in the 36 state legislative chambers the particular occupational group comprised the given percent of members on the committee. The maximum number of legislative sessions is 272 ((32 chambers X 8) + (2 joint committees for four chambers) X 8).

** Entry means that in 7.5 percent of the 252 legislative sessions (no identifiable education committee existed in one chamber for sessions) studied no member on the education committees listed indicated that he or she had an educational occupation.

Table 10

Ratio of Key Occupational Characteristics on Four Committees to Those in the Chamber (19711985)

Ratio	Education Committees	Judiciary Committees	Agriculture Committees	Business Committees
0	4.9%	1.6%	7.2%	.0%
.01- .50	2.0%	.8%	2.5%	9.0%
.51- .99	5.3%	1.9%	.9%	69.4%
1.00	2.0%	.0%	.4%	1.6%
1.01 1.50	15.1%	8.3%	5.9%	20.0%
1.51 2.00	28.2%	22.6%	11.5%	.0%
2.01 2.50	16.3%	17.0%	11.4%	.0%
2.51+	31.0%	47.8%	60.1%	.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	2.06	3.17	3.39	.79
S. D.	1.64	3.29	2.75	.23
N	245	253	236	245

* Entries are percent of committees studied which had the ratio listed to the left.

Table 11a

Educators on Education Committees
(by Year)

	Year							
	1971	1973	1975	1977	1979	1981	1983	1985
Percent Educators on Education Committees								
Mean	17.21	21.56	24.54	22.79	24.41	24.09	27.28	25.54
S. D.	12.71	15.25	12.91	12.77	12.81	15.96	18.01	16.88
Ratio Measure								
Mean	1.84	2.33	2.19	2.65	1.86	1.69	2.07	1.95
S. D.	1.10	1.17	.71	3.76	.82	.89	1.07	1.03

Table 11b

OneWay Analysis of Variance
(by year)

Variable	F-Ratio	Significance Level	Significant Contrasts
Educators on Education Committees	1.34	.234	71/85; 71/83; 71/79; 71/75
Ratio Measure	1.06	.390	77/81; 71/77

Table 12

Educators on Education Committees
by the Degree of Professionalism of State Legislatures

Chamber	Educators on Education Committee			Ratio: Educators on Education Committee/Educators in Chamber		
	Mean	1971	1985	Mean	1971	1985
Senate						
High Professionalism						
CA	39	27	54	1.96	1.82	2.42
OH	31	25	44	1.98	1.65	2.92
PA	28	23	20	1.39	1.26	1.11
WI	18	0	13	.94	.00	.45
Medium Professionalism						
AZ	18	0	11	1.84	.00	3.36
FL	11	0	27	6.96	NA	3.64
GA	16	15	10	1.79	1.38	1.07
IA	33	19	70	2.06	2.38	3.18
TN	12	9	0	2.78	3.03	0.00
WA	29	22	41	1.78	1.82	1.6
Low Professionalism						
NV	11	14	NC	3.02	2.86	NV
NC	13	6	13	1.53	.15	1.61
ND	11	0	0	3.02	.00	.00
SD	39	43	43	1.25	1.37	1.67
TX	3	7	9	1.12	1.03	2.84
WV	17	13	17	1.31	1.51	1.42
House						
High Professionalism						
CA	28	26	23	1.73	1.91	1.85
OH	20	18	22	2.68	2.25	2.74
PA	30	32	29	2.27	2.70	1.97
WI	38	39	37	1.78	1.69	1.94
Medium Professionalism						
AZ	12	10	13	1.05	1.48	1.00
FL	16	8	21	2.47	3.20	1.55
GA	11	9	9	1.71	2.36	1.07
IA	33	18	44	1.79	2.02	1.57
TN	23	13	29	3.28	4.33	3.53
WA	26	38	27	1.50	2.18	1.73
Low Professionalism						
NV	26	43	0	2.40	4.29	NA
NC	18	10	25	1.74	1.13	1.88
ND	31	13	44	2.61	3.24	2.14
SD	46	23	31	1.76	.83	1.96
TX	19	5	22	2.79	1.46	4.19
WV	36	29	44	1.99	1.71	2.10

Bibliography

Basehart, Hubert Harry. 1980. "The Effect of Membership Stability on Continuity and Experience in U.S. State Legislative Committees," LEGISLATIVE STUDIES QUARTERLY 5(February): 55-68.

Browne, William P. 1985. "Policy-Making in the American States: Examining Institutional Variables From a Subsystem's Perspective" AMERICAN POLITICS QUARTERLY 15 (January): 47-86.

Bullock, Charles S. III. 1985. "U.S. Senate Committee Assignments: Preferences, Motivations, and Success," AMERICAN JOURNAL OF POLITICAL SCIENCE 29: 789-808.

Carroll, John J. and Arthur English. 1981. "Governing the House: Leadership in of the State Legislative Party," Paper delivered at the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association.

Clark, Wesley, Jr. and David W. Lippitt. 1978. "Committee Assignment Preferences in a State Legislature: The Case of the New York Assembly." Paper presented at the 1978 Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association.

Elling, Richard C. 1983. "The Relationships Among Bureau Chiefs, Legislative Committees and Interest Groups: A Multistate Study." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association.

Francis, Wayne L. 1982. "State Legislative Committee Systems: The Politics of Reciprocity as an Adaptation." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association.

_____ 1985. "Leadership, Party Caucuses, and Committees in U.S. State Legislatures." LEGISLATIVE STUDIES QUARTERLY 10 (May): 243-257.

Francis, Wayne L. and James W. Riddlesperger. 1982. "U.S. State Legislative Committees: Structure, Procedural Efficiency and Party Control," LEGISLATIVE STUDIES QUARTERLY 5 (February): 31-54.

Freeman, J. Leiper. 1965. THE POLITICAL PROCESS: EXECUTIVE BUREAU-LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE RELATIONS. Rev. ed. New York: Random House.

Griffith, Ernest S. 1939. THE IMPASSE OF DEMOCRACY. New York: Harrison-Hilton Books.

Hamm, Keith E. 1987. "The Prevalence of Subgovernments: Evidence from Nebraska State Legislative Committee Decision Making." Paper presented at the 1987 Midwest Political Science Association Meeting.

Hamm, Keith E. 1986. "Subgovernments and State Legislative Policy Making: An Exploratory Analysis from the Committee Perespective," LEGISLATIVE STUDIES QUARTERLY 11 (August): 321-351.

Heclo, Hugh. 1978. "Issue Networks and the Executive Establishment," in The NEW AMERICAN POLITICAL SYSTEM. Edited by Anthony King. Washington,D.C.:

American Enterprise Institute. pp. 87-124.

Hedlund, Ellen. 1989. "Education Improvement Legislation: The Impact of A Nation at Risk. " Paper presented at the 1989 AERA Meeting.

Hedlund, Ronald D. and Diane Powers. 1989. "Continuity of Committee Membership in 18 States: Committee Constancy, Legislative Experience, and Carryover, 1971-1986.

Jewell, Malcolm E. and Samuel C. Patterson. 1986. THE LEGISLATIVE PROCESS IN THE UNITED STATES. Fourth Edition. New York: Random House.

Kirst, Michael W., Gail Meister and Stephen R. Rowley. 1984. "Policy Issue Networks: Their Influence on State Policymaking," POLICY STUDIES JOURNAL 14 (September): 247-263.

Matthews, Donald R. 1960. U.S. SENATORS AND THEIR WORLD. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Moncrief, Gary. 1981. "Committee Stacking in the Texas House of Representatives," TEXAS JOURNAL OF POLITICAL STUDIES: 44-57.

Oxendale, James R. 1981. "Membership Stability on Standing Committees in Legislative Lower Chambers," STATE GOVERNMENT 54: 126-129.

Ripley, Randall B. and Grace A. Franklin. 1984. CONGRESS, BUREAUCRACY AND PUBLIC POLICY. Third Edition. Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey Press.

Rosenthal, Alan. LEGISLATIVE LIFE: PEOPLE, PROCESSES AND PERFORMANCES IN THE STATES. New York: Harper and Row Publishers.

Rundquist, Barry S. and Gerald S. Strom. "Exploring Bill Construction in Legislative Committees." Unpublished manuscript.

Shepsle, Kenneth A. 1978. THE GIANT JIGSAW PUZZLE: DEMOCRATIC COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS IN THE MODERN HOUSE. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Smith, Steven S. and Christopher J. Deering. 1984. COMMITTEES IN CONGRESS. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly, Inc.

Stanley, Harold W. 1975. SENATE VS. GOVERNOR, ALABAMA 1971: REFERENTS FOR OPPOSITION IN A ONE-PARTY LEGISLATURE. University, AL: University of Alabama Press.

Squire, Peverill. 1988. "Membership Career Opportunities and the Internal Organization of Legislatures," JOURNAL OF POLITICS 50 (AUGUST): 726-744.

Wunnicke, Pat and Sharon Randall. 1986. "Leadership 1980s Style," STATE LEGISLATURES (July): 26-29.